

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JOHN JEAN

vs.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY and  
NATIONAL FRATERNITY OF KAPPA  
DELTA RHO and KAPPA DELTA RHO -  
IOTA CHAPTER and WILLIAM C.  
BABCOCK and DILLON DUTTERA and  
NICHOLAS ZANGHETTI

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 4:20-CV-01722-CCC

**ANSWER OF DEFENDANT, DILLON DUTTERA, TO  
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT WITH  
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES AND CROSCLAIMS**

Defendant, Dillon Duttera, by his attorneys, Mintzer, Sarowitz, Zeris, Ledva & Meyers, LLP, hereby submits his Answer to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint with Affirmative Defenses and Crossclaims and avers as follows:

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

The averments set forth Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint under the heading "Nature of the Case" are denied.

**PARTIES**

1. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.
2. Admitted.
3. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is

required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

4. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

5. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

6. Admitted.

7. Admitted.

8. Admitted.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

9. Admitted.

10. Admitted.

11. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

#### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

12. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

13. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

14. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

15. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

16. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

17. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

18. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

19. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

20. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

21. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

22. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

23. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

24. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

25. Denied.

26. Denied.

27. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

28. Denied.

29. Denied.

30. Denied.

31. Denied.

32. Denied.

33. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

34. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

35. Denied.

36. Denied.

37. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

38. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

39. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

40. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

41. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

42. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

43. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

44. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

45. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

46. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

47. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

48. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

49. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

50. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

51. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

52. Denied.

53. Denied.

54. Denied.

55. Denied.

56. Denied.

57. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

58. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

59. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

60. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

61. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

62. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

63. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

64. After reasonable investigation, Answering Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments contained in this paragraph which are, therefore, denied.

65(a-s.) As they are directed against answering defendant, Dillion Duttera, the allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied. By way of further answer, Answering Defendant denies that he was negligent or reckless at



any time material hereto or that he acted or failed to act in any manner so as to cause Plaintiff to have sustained any injuries or damages as alleged.

**PLAINTIFF JOHN JEAN'S CLAIMS**

**COUNT ONE: HAZING**

**Plaintiff John Jean v. Bucknell University**

66. Defendant hereby incorporates by reference his responses to paragraphs one (1) through sixty-five (65(a-s.)) inclusive of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, as fully as though the same were set forth at length herein.

67. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

68. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

69. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

70. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

71. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

72. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

73. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

74. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

75. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

76. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is

required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

77. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

78. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

79. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

80. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and demands judgment in his favor plus interest, attorney's fees and the costs of suit.

**COUNT TWO: HAZING**

**Plaintiff John Jean v. KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter**

81. Defendant hereby incorporates by reference his responses to paragraphs one (1) through eighty (80) inclusive of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, as fully as though the same were set forth at length herein.

82. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

83. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

84. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

85. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the

extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

86. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

87. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

88. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

89. The allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.

90. The allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.

91. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

92. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and demands judgment in his favor plus interest, attorney's fees and the costs of suit.

**COUNT THREE: HAZING**  
**Plaintiff John Jean v. William C. Babcock and Dillon Duttera**

93. Defendant hereby incorporates by reference his responses to paragraphs one (1) through ninety-two (92) inclusive of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, as fully as though the same were set forth at length herein.

94. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied. To the contrary, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he engaged in any form of conduct including that which is referenced in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at any time material hereto.

95. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied. To the contrary, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he engaged in any form of conduct including that which is referenced in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at any time material hereto.

96. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied. To the contrary, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he engaged in any form of conduct including that which is referenced in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at any time material hereto. Moreover, Answering Defendant denies that he acted in any manner so as to cause Plaintiff to sustain any injuries or damages as alleged.

97. The allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.

98. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied. By way of further answer, Answering Defendant denies that he acted or failed to act in any manner so as to render him liable on Plaintiff's cause of action.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and demands judgment in his favor plus interest, attorney's fees and the costs of suit.

**COUNT FOUR: NEGLIGENCE**  
**Plaintiff John Jean v. Bucknell University**

99. Defendant hereby incorporates by reference his responses to paragraphs one (1) through ninety-eight (98) inclusive of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, as fully as though the same were set forth at length herein.

100. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

101. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

102. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

103. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

104. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is



required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

105. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

106. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

107. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

108. The allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.

109. The allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.

110. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is

required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

111(a-g.) The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

112. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and demands judgment in his favor plus interest, attorney's fees and the costs of suit.

#### **COUNT FIVE: NEGLIGENCE**

##### **Plaintiff John Jean v. KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter**

113. Defendant hereby incorporates by reference his responses to paragraphs one (1) through one hundred twelve (112) inclusive of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, as fully as though the same were set forth at length herein.

114. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

115. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

116. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

117. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

118. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

119. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the

extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

120. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

121. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

122. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

123. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

124. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

125. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

126. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

127. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

128. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the

extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

129. The allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.

130. The allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.

131. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

132(a-h.) The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

133. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendants, KDR National and Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and demands judgment in his favor plus interest, attorney's fees and the costs of suit.

**COUNT SIX: NEGLIGENCE PER SE**

**Plaintiff John Jean v. Defendants Bucknell University, National Fraternity of Kappa Delta Rho, Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter, William C. Babcock, and Dillon Duttera**

134. Defendant hereby incorporates by reference his responses to paragraphs one (1) through one hundred thirty-three (133) inclusive of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, as fully as though the same were set forth at length herein.

135. As they are directed against answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, the allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied. By way of further answer, Answering Defendant denies that he acted in the manner more specifically set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint.

136. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are directed against defendant, Bucknell University. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

137. As they are directed against answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, the allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied. By way of further answer, Answering Defendant denies that he acted in the manner more specifically set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and demands judgment in his favor plus interest, attorney's fees and the costs of suit.

**COUNT SEVEN: ASSAULT AND BATTERY**

**Plaintiff John Jean v. William C. Babcock, Dillon Duttera and Nicholas Zanghetti**

138. Defendant hereby incorporates by reference his responses to paragraphs one (1) through one hundred thirty-seven (137) inclusive of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, as fully as though the same were set forth at length herein.

139. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied. By way of further answer, Answering Defendant denies that he acted in the manner more specifically described in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at any time material hereto.

140. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied. By way of further answer, Answering Defendant denies that he acted in the manner more specifically described in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at any time material hereto.

141. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied. By way of further answer, Answering Defendant denies that he acted in the manner more specifically described in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint at any time material hereto.



142. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's Complaint are directed against defendant, Nicholas Zanghetti. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

143. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied. By way of further answer, Answering Defendant denies that he acted or failed to act in any manner so as to have caused Plaintiff to sustain any injuries or damage as alleged.

144. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's Complaint are directed against defendant, Nicholas Zanghetti. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and demands judgment in his favor plus interest, attorney's fees and the costs of suit.

**COUNT EIGHT: NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**  
**Plaintiff John Jean v. William C. Babcock, Dillon Duttera and Nicholas Zanghetti**

145. Defendant hereby incorporates by reference his responses to paragraphs one (1) through one hundred forty-four (144) inclusive of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, as fully as though the same were set forth at length herein.

146. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the allegations contained in this paragraph are conclusions of law to which the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require no responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied. By way of

further answer, Answering Defendant denies that he acted in a negligent or reckless manner at time material hereto or that he acted or failed to act in any manner so as to have caused Plaintiff to sustain any injuries or damages as alleged.

147. The averments contained in this paragraph of Plaintiff's Complaint are directed against defendant, Nicholas Zanghetti. Therefore, no response is required of Answering Defendant, thereto. To the extent that said averments are deemed to be directed against Answering Defendant herein, said allegations are denied.

148. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and demands judgment in his favor plus interest, attorney's fees and the costs of suit.

**COUNT NINE: FALSE IMPRISONMENT**  
**Plaintiff John Jean v. KDR National, KDR Iota Chapter, William C. Babcock,**  
**Dillon Duttera and Nicholas Zanghetti**

149. Defendant hereby incorporates by reference his responses to paragraphs one (1) through one hundred forty-eight (148) inclusive of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, as fully as though the same were set forth at length herein.

150. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied.

151. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied.

152. As they are directed against defendant, Dillon Duttera, the averments set forth in this paragraph of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint are denied.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and demands judgment in his favor plus interest, attorney's fees and the costs of suit.

**AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES DIRECTED TO PLAINTIFF**

153. Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint fails to state a claim against answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, upon which relief may be granted.

154. If it is determined that Answering Defendant is liable on the Plaintiff's cause of action, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, avers that the Plaintiff's recovery should be eliminated or reduced in accordance with the doctrine of comparative negligence.

155. Answering Defendant further avers that by Plaintiff's actions at the date, time and place stated in the Plaintiff's Civil Action, Plaintiff did assume the risk of any and all injuries and/or damages which he alleges to have suffered, should the same be proven at the time or trial.

156. If Plaintiff suffered any injuries or damages as alleged, those injuries or damages were caused by the conduct of individuals or entities over who/which Answering Defendant had no control.

157. Answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, did not act or fail to act in any manner so as to cause Plaintiff to have sustained any injuries or damages as alleged, should same be proven at the time of trial.

158. Plaintiff's claims are barred due to his failure to mitigate his damages.

159. Plaintiff's claims are barred to the extent that Answering Defendant owed no duty to Plaintiff.

160. Plaintiff's Complaints are barred due to the Doctrine of Intervening or Superseding Cause.

161. Answering Defendant denies that he breached any form of duty that he may be deemed to have owed to Plaintiff at any time material hereto.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and demands judgment in his favor plus interest, attorney's fees and the costs of suit.

**CROSSCLAIMS OF DEFENDANT, DILLON DUTTERA, AGAINST  
DEFENDANTS, BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, NATIONAL FRATERNITY OF  
KAPPA DELTA RHO, KAPPA DELTA RHO, IOTA CHAPTER,  
WILLIAM C. BABCOCK and NICHOLAS ZANGHETTI**

1. Answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, avers that if the averments set forth in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, as are directed against Bucknell University, National Fraternity of Kappa Delta Rho, Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter, William C. Babcock and Nicholas Zanghetti are proven to be true, then the injuries and/or damages allegedly sustained by Plaintiff were caused solely by the negligence and carelessness of defendants, Bucknell University, National Fraternity of Kappa Delta Rho, Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter, William C. Babcock and Nicholas Zanghetti.

2. Answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, avers that in the event Answering Defendant is held liable on Plaintiff's cause of action, said liability being denied, then defendants, Bucknell University, National Fraternity of Kappa Delta Rho, Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter, William C. Babcock and Nicholas Zanghetti, are jointly and/or severally liable, or liable over to Answering Defendant on Plaintiff's cause of action, or are liable to Answering Defendant for indemnification and/or contribution.

WHEREFORE, answering defendant, Dillon Duttera, denies that he is liable on Plaintiff's cause of action and avers that co-defendants, Bucknell University, National Fraternity of Kappa Delta Rho, Kappa Delta Rho, Iota Chapter, William C. Babcock and Nicholas Zanghetti, are solely liable, and/or jointly and severally liable, and/or liable over to Answering Defendant on Plaintiff's cause of action, or are liable to Answering Defendant by way of contribution and/or indemnity and demands judgment in his favor plus attorney's fees, interest and costs.

Respectfully Submitted,

**MINTZER, SAROWITZ, ZERIS, LEDVA & MEYERS, LLP**

BY: /s/ E. Laurence Kates  
E. LAURENCE KATES, ESQUIRE  
Attorney for defendant,  
Dillon Duttera  
Centre Square, West Tower  
1500 Market Street, Suite 4100  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
(215) 735-7200  
**MSZL&M File No. 002340.000071**

**Dated:** 5/17/21

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JOHN JEAN

vs.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY and  
NATIONAL FRATERNITY OF KAPPA  
DELTA RHO and KAPPA DELTA RHO -  
IOTA CHAPTER and WILLIAM C.  
BABCOCK and DILLON DUTTERA and  
NICHOLAS ZANGHETTI

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 4:20-CV-01722-CCC

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, **E. Laurence Kates, Esquire**, hereby certify that I caused to be served a copy of *Answer of defendant, Dillon Duttera, to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint with Affirmative Defenses* to all parties and/or their counsel of record in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of the Rules of Civil Procedure via the Court's Electronic Filing System on **May 17, 2021**.

Service upon:

Aaron Freiwald, Esquire  
Laura E. Laughlin, Esquire  
LAYSER & FREIWALD, P.C.  
1500 Walnut Street, 18th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19102

Michael E. Baughman, Esquire  
TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON  
SANDERS, LLP  
3000 Two Logan Square  
Eighteenth and Arch Streets  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Andrew R. Benedict, Esquire  
Sharon Piper, Esquire  
BARDLSEY, BENEDICT + CHOLDEN, LLP  
1600 Market Street, Suite 1310  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Adam Ryan Martin, Esquire  
TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON  
SANDERS, LLP  
100 Market Street, Suite 200  
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Harry T. Coleman, Esquire  
Owen M. Coleman, Esquire  
LAW OFFICE OF HARRY T.  
COLEMAN, ESQUIRE  
41 N. Main Street  
3rd Floor, Suite 316  
Carbondale, PA 18407

Gary L. Weber, Esquire  
Jessica L. Harlow, Esquire  
MITCHELL GALLAGHER, P.C.  
10 West Third Street  
Williamsport, PA 17701

**MINTZER, SAROWITZ, ZERIS, LEDVA & MEYERS, LLP**

BY: /s/ E. Laurence Kates  
E. LAURENCE KATES, ESQUIRE  
Attorney for defendant,  
Dillon Duttera  
Centre Square, West Tower  
1500 Market Street, Suite 4100  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
(215) 735-7200  
**MSZL&M File No. 002340.000071**

**Dated:** 5/17/21